

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

None of the claims are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 are currently pending and under consideration.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5 and 10-11 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER STUCKE (US 5,335,146) IN VIEW OF DURSTON ET AL. (US 6,154,373) AND DEBORD ET AL. (US 6,932,617)

The present invention as recited in claim 1, for example, relates to “[a]n information-processing device comprising: a crossbar board-back panel assembly comprising a plurality of crossbar-boards each having a switching element mounted thereon, and a plurality of back panels detachably connected electrically and mechanically to different sides of each of said crossbar-boards, a plurality of motherboards detachably connected electrically and mechanically to each of said back panels, each of the plurality of the motherboards having an information-processing semiconductor element mounted thereon, wherein each of said back panels is formed by a plurality of strip panels arranged at positions corresponding to said crossbar-boards, said motherboards crossing the plurality of the strip panels, and said strip panels are supplied with different voltages.”

Stucke relates a packaging of electronic circuits, and particularly to the interconnecting of the electronic circuits to other devices and circuits which require large numbers of interconnections.

Durston teaches a high density cross-connection system in which secondary backplane boards are secured to a main backplane board to provide interconnection paths in a direction transverse to interconnection paths provided on the main backplane board.

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner states that Durston teaches a motherboard (28). However, Durston clearly denotes element 28 as a plurality of connectors 28, which is not the same as a motherboard.

Assuming, for example, that the circuit board (12) of Durston corresponds to a motherboard, the strip panels (24) of the Durston correspond to the crossbar board (24) of Stucke, meaning that the crossbar board includes a plurality of the strip panels. Accordingly, the

combination of Durston and Stucke cannot produce the results of the present invention in which *“each of said back panels is formed by a plurality of strip panels arranged at positions corresponding to said crossbar-boards”* (emphasis added).

Therefore, it is submitted that Durston and Stucke, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Claim 2 of the present invention, for example, relates to an information-processing device comprising “a crossbar board-back panel assembly comprising a plurality of rectangular crossbar-boards arranged in parallel, and two opposing back panels detachably connected electrically and mechanically to longitudinal sides of each of said crossbar-boards.”

The Examiner believes that Stucke teaches all of the features recited in claim 2. However, there is nothing in the Stucke reference that teaches or suggests “a crossbar board-back panel assembly comprising a plurality of rectangular crossbar-boards arranged in parallel, and two opposing back panels detachably connected electrically and mechanically to longitudinal sides of each of said crossbar-boards.”

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 2 and distinguish over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 2.

Claim 5 of the present invention, for example, relates to an information-processing device comprising “hollow heat-radiation components each placed between said crossbar-boards, wherein an air moves through inside of said hollow heat-radiation components.”

Debord teaches a fragmented backplane system for I/O applications. The Examiner states that Debord teaches hollow heat radiation components, each placed between the crossbar-board in FIGS. 2 and 3.

The Examiner suggests that the components [210] as shown in FIG. 2 of Debord correspond to the hollow heat radiation components. However, Debord teaches that the components [210] are circuit boards, which are not the same as hollow heat radiation components. Therefore, Stucke and Debord, either alone or in combination, do not teach the features recited in claim 5.

With regard to claims 10 and 11, the Examiner states that each structural element of claim 10 and 11 are recited in claim 1 of the Stucke reference, but does not explain specific correspondence between the structural elements of claims 10 and 11 of the present application and the structural elements of claim 1 of the Stucke reference.

Considering, for example, that each structural element of the claimed invention should be

indicated in the figures, Figure 1 of the Stucke reference should indicate each structural element of claim 1 of the Stucke reference. However, FIG. 1 of the Stucke reference does not teach or suggest a cross board-back panel assembly. Accordingly, Stucke does not teach or suggest the cross board-back panel assembly as recited in claims 10 and 11 of the present invention.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1-5-06

By: 
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501